



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,741	04/09/2004	Werner Stuffle	SCH-00086	2454
7590 12/22/2005				
Warn, Burgess & Hoffmann, P.C.				
P.O. Box 70098				
Rochester Hills, MI 48307				
			EXAMINER	
			CARTER, WILLIAM JOSEPH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/821,741	STUFFLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William J. Carter	2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/07/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, "the diaphragm" and "the direct-current network" lack antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolpasky (6,545,418) in view of Barnes (6,158,869).

With respect to claim 1, Kolpasky shows a speaker unit for use in a motor vehicle, comprising: at least one speaker (12) having a chassis; and at least one light source (27), the at least one light source being installed in the chassis of a speaker electrically connected to the direct-current network on board the motor vehicle (33) (the speaker unit to connect to the vehicles electrical system, which is direct-current, through item 33). Kolpasky does not show the at least one light source installed outside of the diaphragm. Barnes, drawn to light attachment to speakers, teaches at least one light source (18) installed outside of the diaphragm (Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the light configuration

Art Unit: 2875

of Barnes in the speaker of Kolpasky, in order to achieve the best possible lighting on the intended surface (Abstract).

As for claim 4, Kolpasky further shows the speaker unit further comprising a single electrical intersection (33) with the vehicle circuit. Kolpasky does not show

With respect to claim 5, Kolpasky teaches all of the claimed elements, as disclosed above, except for the light source being arranged parallel to the axis of a speaker. Barnes teaches light-emitting diodes arranged in any two or three-dimensional configuration (column 4, lines 58-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the arrangements of Barnes in the speaker unit of Kolpasky, in order to achieve the best possible lighting on the intended surface (Abstract).

As for claim 6, Kolpasky further shows the speaker unit wherein the light source (27) is arranged perpendicular to the axis of a speaker (12).

As for claim 7, Kolpasky teaches all of the claimed elements, as disclosed above, except for at least one light source being followed by a dispersion disk. Barnes, drawn to light attachment to speakers, shows a light source (18) followed by a dispersion disk (48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the teaching of a light source followed by a dispersion disk of Barnes in the speaker unit of Kolpasky, in order to create a maximum dispersion of the light generated by the light-emitting diode (column 4, lines 18-21).

As for claim 8, Kolpasky further shows the speaker unit wherein at least one light source is a light-emitting diode (27).

As for claim 9, Kolpasky further shows the speaker unit further comprising a light transmissive material (21, 23, 25) adjacent to the light emitting diode for allowing light to be dispersed into the interior of a vehicle.

As for claim 10, Kolpasky further shows the speaker unit wherein the light-emitting diode and transmissive material form one component (Fig. 2).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolpasky and Barnes as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chun-Ying (5,964,519).

With respect to claim 2, Kolpasky and Barnes teach all of the claimed elements, as disclosed above, except for the light source being screwed into the chassis. Chun-Ying, drawn to a light and speaker assembly, teaches the use of a light (5) that is screwably secured in a light holder (Column 2, lines 45-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the teaching of a screwably secured light of Chun-Ying to attach the lights to the speaker of Kolpasky, in order to achieve a simple and secure attachment of the light to the chassis.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolpasky and Barnes as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Quinones (6,283,414).

With respect to claim 3, Kolpasky and Barnes teach all of the claimed elements, as disclosed above, except for the light source being soldered into the chassis. Quinones, drawn to attaching lights, teaches the use of soldering to attach small lights (column 8, lines 17-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the teaching of soldering to attach small lights of

Art Unit: 2875

Quinones to attach the lights to the speaker of Kolpasky, in order to achieve a simple and secure attachment of the light to the chassis.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William J. Carter whose telephone number is (571)272-0959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Renee S. Luebke can be reached on (571)272-2009. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2875

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

wjc
12/13/05


RENEE LUEGKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER